



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/359,874 | 07/27/1999 | JOSEPH L. HELLERSTEIN | YO999-131 | 3396 |

7590 09/13/2002

WILLIAM E LEWIS
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS LLP
90 FOREST AVE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER

HO, THE T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/359,874

Applicant(s)

HELLERSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

The T. Ho

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed 07/27/1999.
2. Claims 1-20 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer U.S Patent No. 6,118,936 in view of APA.

As to claim 1, Lauer discloses analyzing non-fully structured data (Fig. 6) associated with one or more events (collect data from network elements 602, Fig. 6 and lines 41-46 column 3); parsing at least a portion of the non-fully structured data (610, Fig. 6) according to one or more parsing rules (614, Fig. 6) to convert the at least a portion of non-fully structured data to structured data (616, Fig. 6); providing presentation operations (714, Fig. 7a); provide a graphical representation of the at least a portion of structured data (network topology information is used to provide graphical displays, lines 57-58 column 5). However, Lauer does not teach presenting the non-fully structured data and summary representation of the structured data.

APA teaches presenting the non-fully structured data (lines 18-19 page 2) and summary representation of the structured data (aggregate events and analyze summary

information, lines 26-27 page 2). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of APA to the system of Lauer because this provides the user different approaches to view the structured data.

As to claim 3, Lauer as modified further discloses modifying the parsing rules to affect the parsing operation (allows the operator to limit the scope of his displays, lines 50-52 column 14).

As to claims 4-5, rubber-banding and zooming operations are conventional. It would have been obvious that the graphical displays of Lauer can include these techniques because they will provide better viewing of the data to the users.

As to claim 6, APA further teaches summary representation includes one or more attributes (event counts, line 27 page 2) associated with the structured data.

As to claim 7, Lauer as modified further discloses providing a selection operation (select All, or Clear, Fig. 8i).

As to claim 8, Lauer as modified further discloses providing a filtering operation (Filter Definition Window screen display window, lines 50-51 column 14).

As to the system of claim 9, note the discussion of the method of claim 1 above. Lauer as modified further discloses a parsing engine (610, Fig. 6), viewers (Fig. 8b-8j), and a selection and control engine coupled to the parsing engine and the viewers (SNMS 300, line 35 column 7), which controls operations associated with the parsing engine and the viewers.

As to claim 10, Lauer as modified further discloses the operations controlled by the selection and control engine include data and parsing rule access. (SNMS parses

Art Unit: 2151

event, lines 36 column 7, and event is parsed according to defined parsing rules, lines 49-50 column 9).

As to claims 11, Lauer as modified further discloses communications between the viewers (lines 4-59 column 12).

As to the apparatus of claim 12, note the discussion of the method of claim 1 above. Moreover, the processor and memory are conventional. It would have been obvious that the system of Lauer (servers and client workstations, lines 38-42 column 4) can include these units because they are required for the system to operate.

As to claims 14-19, note the discussions of claims 3-8 above.

As to the product of claim 20, note the discussion of the method of claim 1 above.

4. Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer in view of APA, and further in view of David.

As to claim 2, Lauer as modified does not teach providing coordinated views for at least two of the graphical representation, the summary representation and the non-fully structured data presentation. David (Fig. 3) provides coordinated views of the graphical representation (the dots) and the summary representation (150 points). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Davis to the system of Lauer for convenience purpose because the user can view different representations of the data at the same time.

As to claim 13, note the discussion of claim 2 above.

Conclusion

Please refer to the references listed on the attached PTO-892, which are not relied upon in the claim rejections detailed above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The T. Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-5540. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday, 8:30 am – 6:00 pm, and every other Friday from 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C 20231

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240

t.h
September 8, 2002


ST. JOHN COURTENAY III
PRIMARY EXAMINER